UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,345	09/25/2003	Valerie Walker	1456-3/MBE	6610

38735 7590 02/04/2010

DIMOCK STRATTON LLP
20 QUEEN STREET WEST, 32nd FLOOR, BOX 102
TORONTO, ON M5H 3R3
CANADA

EXAMINER	
SCHATZ, CHRISTOPHER T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1791	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/04/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/669,345	WALKER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHRISTOPHER SCHATZ	1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 October 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 11-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 11-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-7 and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Yamamoto et al.

As to claim 1, Yamamoto teaches a method comprising: positioning a first material 33 on a work surface 39 with an adhesion zone exposed and applying an anchoring adhesive 34' to the first material or second material or both to form a plurality of substantially isolated adhesive anchors separated by interstitial spaces (Figure 11; column 5, line 56 – column 6, line 33). After the adhesive anchors 34' have cured (column 11, lines 2-4) to form a plurality of physical and chemical bonding sites within the adhesion zone the reference teaches: applying a bonding adhesive 32 to the first material before the bonding adhesive has cured (column 6, lines 45-46), placing the second material into contact with the adhesive anchors and curing the bonding adhesive to bond the bonding adhesive to the adhesive anchors (column 10, line 52 - column 11, line 23; column 7, lines 25-55), whereby the adhesive anchors have a relatively higher degree of adhesion to the first material or to the second material or to both than the bonding adhesive after curing, and the bonding adhesive intrudes into the interstitial spaces before curing and when cured bonds to the adhesive anchors

(column 7, lines 25-55; column 5, lines 20-55; column 11, lines 24-30; column 15, lines 4-18; figure 11). The adhesive anchors have a relatively higher degree of adhesion to the first material than the degree of adhesion of the bonding adhesive to the first material because the anchoring adhesive is cured to the first material (see above cited text) and the bonding adhesive is not cured when first applied to the first material. The claim does not require that the anchoring adhesive have a relatively higher degree of adhesion to the first material than the degree of adhesion of the bonding material *after* the bonding material has cured. As amended the claim only recites "after curing". It does not recite "after curing of the second adhesive". Contrary to the applicant's assertion, the claim does not require a difference in degree of adhesion after curing of the second adhesive. Additionally, the bonded material is removed from the work surfaces

As to claim 11, Yamamoto teaches a method comprising: positioning a first material 33 on a work surface 39 with an adhesion zone exposed and applying an anchoring adhesive 34' to the first material or second material or both to form a plurality of substantially isolated adhesive anchors separated by interstitial spaces (Figure 11; column 5, line 56 – column 6, line 33). After the adhesive anchors 34' have cured (column 11, lines 2-4) to form a plurality of physical and chemical bonding sites within the adhesion zone the reference teaches: applying a casting adhesive 32 to the first material before the casting adhesive has cured (column 6, lines 45-46), allowing the casting adhesive to cure whereby the adhesive anchors have a relatively higher degree of adhesion to the first material or to the second material or to both than the casting adhesive,

and the casting adhesive intrudes into the interstitial spaces before curing and when cured bonds to the adhesive anchors (column 7, lines 25-55; column 5, lines 20-55; column 11, lines 24-30; column 15, lines 4-18; figure 11; column 10, line 52 - column 11, line 23; column 7, lines 25-55). The casting adhesive is removed from the work surface.

As to claims 2 and 12, Yamamoto teaches such a claimed screen printing step (column 10, line 65 - column 11, line 7; column 16, lines 8-24). As to claims 3 and 13, the reference teaches the anchoring adhesive applied in a uniform pattern (figure 11). As to claims 4 and 14, Yamamoto teaches the claimed adhesive impervious portions. As to claims 6, 16, 5 and 15, the reference teaches that the anchoring adhesive is rigid (column 5, lines 1-26) and that the bonding adhesive is flexible (column 1, lines 13-14). Yamamoto also teaches the limitations of claim 7 (figure 11, column 15, lines 3-18).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 10/14/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant's arguments state that the reference fails to disclose that the anchoring adhesive has a relatively higher degree of adhesion to the first material than the degree of adhesion of the bonding adhesive to the first material are addressed in the discussion of claim 1 above. The amendments to the claims do not overcome this because the claim does not require the difference in degree of adhesion after curing *of the second material*.

The applicant argues that purpose of the claimed method is different from that of Yamamoto. These arguments are not germane. It does change that Yamamoto discloses all of the limitations of the claims as stated above. The applicant argues that the conductive bumps do not have any adhesive properties and that the functional, structural and physical limitations preclude the anchors 34 from having physical and chemical bonding sites. The applicant is referred to section 7, third full paragraph of the Office Action dated 06/16/2009. The fact that the bumps are conductive in no way precludes them from also functioning as an adhesive.

The applicant argues that Yamamoto's caul is not strong enough to support any materials. First, this statement is speculation. Nothing in Yamamoto discloses or says that the surface 39 cannot support a material. The applicant should be aware that the claims do not recite any physical or structural limitations that distinguish the claimed "work surface" from the surface formed by 39 in Yamamoto. The claims do not require that work surface support a certain load, nor does it require a specific bending or breaking strength.

The applicant emphasizes that the work surface forms part of the finished product in Yamamoto. Column 14, lines 16-17 directly contradicts this assertion: "the laminate was picked up and *the sheet 39 on both sides were removed*.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER SCHATZ whose telephone number is 571-272-6038. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on 571-272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CHRISTOPHER SCHATZ/
Examiner, Art Unit 1791

/Richard Crispino/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791